

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed March 1, 2007 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 10, 13, 14, 19, 21, 26, and 28 have been amended. Claims 2, 11, 17, 18, 20, and 27 have been canceled.

Support for the amendments is found in the specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed. Applicants respectfully submit therefore that the amendments do not add new matter.

With this amendment it is respectfully submitted the claims satisfy the statutory requirements.

The 35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection

Claims 10-14, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because allegedly the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The phrase, ‘computer-readable media’ in claims 10-14 and the phrase, ‘A data stream embodied in a carrier signal’ in claims 17 and 18 are non-statutory subject matters because they have not been further defined anywhere in the disclosure and they can be construed to encompass an unpatentable medium such as an electromagnetic carrier signal which is not a “process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter.”

In response, applicants respectfully submit that definition and support for the limitation of “computer-readable media” is found in the specification, for example at paragraph 43.

Applicants have canceled claims 17 and 18. Applicants submit that the claims as amended are not directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph Rejection

Claims 4, 6-9, 13-18 and 26-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter applicant regards as the invention. This objection is respectfully traversed.

In regard to claims 4 and 13, applicants have amended the claims to provide proper antecedent bases.

In regard to the use of the limitations “body”, “contact”, and “request” applicants have amended the claims to further clarify the limitations in view of the specification.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1-5, 10-13 and 19-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by each of Wanderlich¹, Fernandez², and Kaaresoja et al.³.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-5, 10-13 and 19-25, as amended, are not anticipated by any of the cited references alone or in combination. Claim 1, for example, includes the following limitations.

¹ U.S. Patent No. 6,028,531

² U.S. Patent No. 4,851,820

³ U.S. Patent No. 6,963,762

A method, comprising:
receiving an input signal associated with an actuation of a user-interface member on a first handheld communication device;
determining a haptic code associated with the actuation;
including the haptic code in an output signal; and
sending the output signal to a second handheld communication device remote from the first handheld communication device.

(Amended claim 1) (Emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references include the limitations of sending the output signal to a second remote device, where the output signal includes a haptic code associated with an actuation of a user-interface member on a first device.

As claimed, the input signal is associated with an actuation of a user-interface member of the first device. None of the cited references disclose or suggest a haptic code associated with the actuation of the user-interface member, which is then included in an output signal and sent to a second, remote device.

For these reasons applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 10, and 19 as amended, are not anticipated by any of the cited references alone or in combination.

As to dependent claims 3-5, 12-13 and 21-25, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,

THELEN REID BROWN
RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP

Dated: June 19, 2007



Thomas Van Zandt
Reg. No. 43,219

Thelen Reid Brown Raysman & Steiner LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax. (408) 287-8040